

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable consideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claim 14 is pending in the present application. Claims 1-13 and 15 are canceled; and Claim 14 is amended by the present amendment. Claim 14 is amended to be in independent form by incorporating the subject matter of independent Claim 13. No new matter is presented.

In the Official Action, Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Gaddis.

In the outstanding Official Action, Claim 15 was objected to because of a minor informality; Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Gaddis et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002-0069292); Claims 3, 8 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Tsao (U.S. Publication No. 2002-0080819); Claims 5, 9, 10 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Morishige et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002-0026482); Claims 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Jorgensen (U.S. Publication No. 2002-0099854); Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Oppenheimer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,388,213); Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Dillon et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,968,129); and Claim 14 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

The undersigned also appreciatively acknowledge the courtesy extended by Examiner Fox by holding a personal interview with the undersigned on October 27, 2005. During the interview, an overview of the invention was presented and the pending claims were discussed in light of the applied references. No agreement was reached during the interview pending a formal response to the outstanding Official Action.

The outstanding Official Action objected to Claim 14 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but stated that the claim would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening Claims. In response, Claim 14 is amended to be in independent form by incorporating the subject matter of canceled independent Claim 13 (the only claim from which it depends). Therefore, as Claims 1-13 and 15 are canceled the outstanding prior art rejections are moot and the application is believed to be in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes any additional formal matter need be addressed in order to place this application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the Examiner's convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



---

Bradley D. Lytle  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)

Andrew T. Harry  
Registration No. 56,959